

LETTERS FROM THE PEOPLE

REPLY TO THE REV. J. MARSH.

To the Editor of The N. Y. Tribune.

SIR: The Rev. Dr. Marsh, in his letter published in Friday's TRIBUNE, does not reply to the "complaint" referred to in his opening sentence, nor justify his attack upon Mr. Delavan, while overlooking the case. The case is simply this: Dr. Marsh, through his journal, charged upon Mr. Delavan that the latter availed himself of his position as President of the State Temperance Society, in his opening address at its late annual meeting, to "thrust upon the public" a "pestilent brew," a "false position," "an absurdity," both false in itself and destructive to its tendency. This charge was denied by the journal in which Dr. Marsh professed to be a writer, and to which he was a contributor. He did not, reply; and that denial was sustained by quotations of all that portion of Mr. Delavan's address upon which the charge could have been predicated. What Professor Lewis may have said or

Dr. Marsh should not seem to escape the odium of making a groundless charge, by raising an entirely new issue; but should either *prove* his specific accusation or *withdraw* it. He chooses to do neither, though left an opportunity to do the latter hoarably, on the ground of *misapprehension*.

Impersonal orthodoxy was "an invidious attack upon a veteran advocate of our cause," or a "contending for principle," as he claims, the public are quite as competent to judge for themselves as I am for them.

LETTERS LOST AND WHO IS TO BLAME.
To the Editor of The N. Y. Tribune.

SIR: It annoys me to trouble you, yet I with others are more anxious to prevent the constant recurrence of the cause of annoyance I know not, but myself and many of my friends are so shamefully treated by the post officials in New-York that I am led to ask you, Sir, if there is any way by which the wrong I now write of can be remedied.

The facts are these: I send off from six to eight letters a week, and to prevent the loss of only about one-third of the number are ever heard of again. Within the past six weeks the loss has been greater than ever before. I am informed of a friend who lately mailed fourteen letters all for Rochester, N. Y., yet only two of the number reached their destination, and the rest were lost. The cause of the loss, and of which has been seen by the person to whom it was addressed. This morning I heard of another who has been staying at Saratoga a month, and whose friends sent a number of letters and papers to him while there, but they did not arrive. Now, Sir, can you suggest a way by which the loss of letters may be prevented?

ally? It is really too bad that a person should spend his time writing, and pay postage for conveying letters, and after being kept in suspense two or three weeks find out by writing once or twice more, that former letter had been received and answered. I have sometimes come to hand new letters, but it is a rare case: one letter post marked New York, July 5, and directed to Hacksville, L. I., via Jericho, arrived on the 17th of August, going the entire distance of twenty-eight miles in forty-three days *mean time*. I looked upon this delay as a blunder of some public official, who probably put it into the hands of the postmaster at Jericho in Palestine, a place the neighborhood of which, according to Holy Writ, is notorious for thieves; and that some one of the thieving fraternity, after searching for treasure and finding none, retold and returned it to the worthy post master, thus revealing the blunder, and giving him no opportunity to hand it over to his owner.

EVERY MAN A BROTHER.

Yorkeville, N. Y., Sept. 1, 1854.

THE SMITHSONIAN QUARREL.

To the Editor of *The N. Y. Tribune*.

SIR: It is unnecessary to reply at length to the letters of "A Friend of Mr. Jewett," which appeared in *THE TRIBUNE* of the 31st August.

After more than thirty days since my letter was published, this "friend" appears with the most abusive, unfair and unscrupulous statements, denying some of the facts I had asserted, while the important

tempted on impart, or by any one else, to show that the Smithsonian controversy was a "scandalous personal quarrel between Peabody and Jewett," and to show conclusively that it was not. I was to show conclusively and beyond all question that Mr. Jewett had manifested a spirit of insubordination and hostility to the Secretary and the Board of Regents, which fully justified the action of the Board in removing him from the Institution impossible. How could he himself be willing longer to associate with men whose conduct had been so "dishonorable, illegal and unjust," as he and his co-workers had been? How could he permit any assistant of his to retain his situation while using his time and means and energies to ruin his character and force him to leave the Institution? How could he permit any assistant of his to do this? Why is it that not a word of *reproach* has been expressed by any of our city papers at Mr. Jewett's removal? Why are the lamentation and indignation only heard from Boston? The public generally, I believe, are not aware that Prof. Henry is a man of virtue and integrity, and that he would not resort to any dishonest means to carry out his plans, and especially to such a course as this.

urrier, Dallas, Totten, Maury, would not be guilty of such a course in the management of a public situation." "My friend Mr. Jewett," from Boston," said, "I am sure you will be required to overthrow and bring into contempt the opinions and actions of such men. With the public we are content to leave the verdict, and as to the bold denials of your correspondent of my former statements, I am unable to see that one of them has been answered or successfully refuted. I will not say," and this "A Friend to Mr. Jewett" will add on the side advised by
 KRUMS.
 Washington, Sept. 1, 1854.

◆

INTERFERENCE AND THE CLEVER.

To the Editor of *The N. Y. Tribune*.

SIR: I HAVE just read the excellent remarks in your last **SEMI-WEEKLY TRIBUNE**, with reference to the lamentable propensity of the Irish to interference. I think what you say, if the clergy of New York would use their efforts to eradicate the crying evil, or in a word, if they would turn Father Mathews, much good might be done. The true Catholic cannot gaze upon the dazzling temples in your City, where his religion is displayed, without the harrowing thought that they are erected for the most part with the money of rascals, of blood-drinking and elaborate

nals than with the costly cathedral, with widows' tears and man's misery for foundation. The power of the clergy for good is everywhere throughout Canada strikingly illustrated. There the bishops and priests have established temperance, not only by preaching but by example, as in the case of the Good Shepherd, its crying cry. I thank you, Mr. Greeley, for your kindness in pressing this matter on the attention of the republican Catholics. Continue to do so, and heaven must bless your efforts. For my part, although a confirmed member of the church, I am no less free to condemn evil of all kinds and in all places. I am sure that Mgr. of New-York would receive a hundred fold recompense in the eternal mansions, as well as the love of all Protestants, (as he has now

fare upon the infernal King Alcohol. You are at liberty to give these lines to your readers. In the meanwhile I remain yours truly,
MINIMUS SERVORUM DEI.
St. Hyacinthe, L. C., Aug. 31, 1854.

THE CATHOLICS AND SCHOOL MONEY.
To the Editor of The N. Y. Tribune.
SIR: I have the following in your paper of this morning, in an article on Schools in this City:
"The Catholic Schools participate in the apportionment of the School money—the others are sustained by the respective denominations."
This statement is entirely erroneous. There is no distinction between the religious denominations in relation to the School money. None of them—Catholic or Protestant—participate in the apportionment of these moneys. I would not ask you to make the correction, but I would ask you to publish the following:

such a statement should not pass uncontradicted.
Yours truly,
E. C. BENEDICT.
New-York, Sept. 4.

FIRE AT GEORGETOWN, S. C.—A destructive fire occurred at Georgetown, South Carolina, on the 27th ult., destroying property to the amount of \$25,000, on which there was \$14,000 insurance. The entire range of buildings from Waterman's wharf to Broadway, and the square opposite (except Mrs. Lister's hotel, at the house the corner where old Mr. Waldo once lived), are all in ashes. The fire crossed to the house of Mrs. Walker, which was also burnt, and here it was finally arrested. Many families are without homes to go to, and no one knows where to turn. The town is in flames in three different places, the fire being subject to plunders; and much of the property saved from the fire was stolen during the confusion.